From: Stuart Gedal
To: Simmons, Denise
Subject: Re: From Stuart Gedal: Permission
Date: Thursday, April 19, 2018 7:56:54 PM

Got it. Great explanation. I hadn't made the connection to the Open Meeting Law. That makes total sense.

I guess I'm old fashioned. I treat an e-mail like we used to treat letters: private until told otherwise.

Thanks so much.
Stuart

Stuart Gedal
Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 19, 2018, at 7:15 PM, Simmons, Denise <dsimmons@cambridgema.gov> wrote:

> Hello Stuart,
>
> Thank you for checking with me on this. The only concern I have is that I do not wish to possibly violate our Open Meeting Laws, which are designed to prevent public matters from being debated behind closed doors. It is clear to me that I could not discuss this matter with four of my colleagues ahead of any public meeting (as the five of us would then constitute a majority of the Council) - that deliberation can only be done in a public forum, during which the members of the public can listen to the debate in real time (and thus be assured that every matter is being given a fair hearing). It is also clear to me that my exchanging texts or emails with my colleagues about a matter prior to its public hearing would be a clear violation of OML.
>
> What is less clear to me is whether my suggesting that my email can be shared with my colleagues by a third party might also violate the Open Meeting Law. Doing so would certainly allow my colleagues to know my views on a matter that we may all be voting on later prior to our actual public deliberations - and I do not know whether my tacitly endorsing this could potentially be seen as violating the spirit of the law. Thus, in the interest of not wishing to risk that violation, I am going to offer no opinion as to how you should proceed and I will trust your best judgment on this matter. Thank you, again, for reaching out.
>
> ---
>
> **From:** Stuart Gedal <waterbury59@comcast.net>
> **Sent:** Thursday, April 19, 2018 12:29 PM
> **To:** Simmons, Denise
> **Subject:** From Stuart Gedal: Permission

Denise-

I'd like to ask your permission to share our e-mail exchange about the possible HP Boycott resolution with Craig Kelley (and only Craig Kelley). I've written separate letters to each Councilor, but each was different based on my previous relationship (or lack of relationship) with them.

I wrote my e-mail to you after having written several others. It was the clearest one I wrote; and our exchange, I think, was the most on-point one that I've had.

If you don't want me to share, I won't. I understand if you want to keep an exchange with a constituent private. I thought our focus on deliberations and whether this proposal is a "fit" with the the role of the City Council on social justice issues was a helpful perspective.

Below is what I will e-mail to Craig, including an explanation of what he's about to read. That way, you can see the exchange the way he will see it.

Thank you for considering my request.

Regards,
Stuart

Stuart Gedal
617-543-6792

***
Hello, Craig-

Having pondered this topic and written each of the other Councilors, I asked Denise Simmons for permission to forward my exchange of e-mails with her (to you and you only). Since I wrote to her after I had written e-mails to several other councilors, my e-mail to her is the most concise statement of my views. The passage of a few days since you and I last e-mailed has also given me time to gather more information. I feel that this exchange gets to the essence of what's wrong with the approach of those who favor the boycott of HP at this time.

Were you able to have your meetings? How did they go? Now that I have an opinion, I'm glad to attend any meeting with you, whether it's to discuss why the resolution should be opposed, or to bring opposing sides together. Please let me know how I can be helpful. Thanks.

Stuart

Begin forwarded message:

From: Stuart Gedal <waterbury59@comcast.net>
Date: April 17, 2018 at 9:04:54 PM EDT
To: "Simmons, Denise" <dsimmons@cambridgema.gov>
Subject: Re: PLEASE VOTE NO ON ONE-SIDED BOYCOTT RESOLUTION

Hello, Denise.

I appreciate your responding so quickly and completely. Thanks for the very detailed and clear explanation of the "non-status" of the resolution at the moment.

I especially appreciate your logic and calm because two groups supporting the passage of a resolution with very sharp wording about the Middle East sent out webmails last night. Their webmails both state matter-of-factly that there IS a resolution, that 5 Councilors are committed to voting for it, and list in pretty bold headline who they are.

These came from the Mass HP Boycott organization and the Voice for Peace group. One of them mentions or shows that their distribution group is 1,000 people. They were given what appears to be misinformation.

As a long-time activist, I'm not used to large outside groups taking the lead on local issues. Certainly we called on experts—lawyers, architects, urban planners, etc.—to reinforce our positions, but we were not led from outside of Cambridge.

We were residents on a block who met with a neglectful landlord, or members of a neighborhood-wide group who met for years or months with Simplex or WR Grace. Or, on immigration issues, we were colleagues (staff of community agencies) like Centro Presente, CLC, COPA, Concilio, etc. who relied on the trust of others. We would have never risked our credibility by sending out alarmist news ahead

of a Council vote.

Thank you again for stressing the procedure and the chance to air views and gather information. Thank you, too, for the suggestion that we need to confer with people in government (staff from our Rep or Senators) with experience in foreign affairs.

Best wishes,
Stuart

Sent from my iPad

On Apr 17, 2018, at 7:08 PM, Simmons, Denise <dsimmons@cambridgema.gov> wrote:

> Hello Stuart,
>
> Thank you for your email. So far, I have not yet seen an actual draft of the proposed resolution asking the City to cease purchasing HP equipment and supplies. I understand there's been a great deal of concern in the community about this matter – yet I must underscore that this will only appear on the City Council's April 23 agenda if one or more City Councilors sponsor it. We will not know if it is on the agenda until either a City Councilor publicly declares that they'll be sponsoring this (to my knowledge, this has not happened), or until the agenda is finalized by the Clerk's Office and posted online this Thursday evening around 5:30 pm. I can, at the very least, confirm that *I* am not a sponsor of such a resolution.
>
> There have been numerous op-eds, emails, and social media posts condemning the City Council for rushing this to a vote without adequate opportunities for the public to weigh in, or even giving people a chance to read the resolution. Some people have condemned the City Council for seemingly being on the brink of passing this resolution, or for seemingly being on the brink of rejecting it. While I understand the passion behind this matter, I must clarify that we do not yet even have a resolution or policy order in

front of us, there has been absolutely no debate about this amongst the City Councilors, and the City Council will not have an opportunity to discuss this amongst ourselves unless and until a resolution is sponsored by at least one of us and introduced at a public meeting. At this point, I am not yet certain if such a resolution will be introduced or not.

I appreciate your reaching out and sharing your views on this. I am currently reading up on this issue to be better informed, I am reviewing all the emails and letters coming in about this issue, and I am reaching out to our representatives in Congress to seek their input on an issue that is more international than municipal in scope. Should this matter end up on before the City Council – either on April 23 or at a later date – I will look forward to engaging in a thoughtful discussion and debate with my colleagues on the Council and then seeing how to best resolve this matter in a way that allows everyone to feel they have had a fair chance to be heard. Thank you.

E. Denise Simmons

From: STUART GEDAL <waterbury59@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, April 16, 2018 10:59 PM
To: Simmons, Denise
Subject: PLEASE VOTE NO ON ONE-SIDED BOYCOTT RESOLUTION

Hello, Denise --

I'm writing you about how I hope you will vote on what appears to be an upcoming Council resolution regarding the discussion about the use of technology in relation to personal privacy and social justice.

My understanding is that a draft resolution is circulating, but that it has somehow been pushed in the direction of being a resolution aimed at one particular use or application of Hewlett-Packard (HP) technology.

I think that this push, which is in deference to an outside organization's efforts to ftake one side in the Middle East conflict, really derails our Cambridge discussion of how the City can move forward in those instances where companies like HP and others use technology for purposes that harm us or our freedoms.

HP, like other tech companies, is worldwide, but somehow the authors of the resolution have aimed it squarely at one what must be dozens of governments who use HP's technology. Because this country is Israel, and is deeply embroiled in complicated cross-cultural and military situations, the resolution is likely to polarize rather than unite social activists.

We need to move forward together to react to a number of instances where technologies developed in Cambridge or used by Cambridge government are being used here in the US and federal and state regulation can help guarantee our freedom and privacy. Israel should not be singled out from other nations, for example Russia, China, the Philippines, and many others who have flawed governments that misuse technology against their own people.

I hope that you will work to prevent this one-sided resolution, aimed at one small country, from being reported to the floor of the Council for a vote. If it does go forward, I urge you to vote against it.

I've attached an explanation in letter format that

expresses my point of view. I am happy if you share it with other Councilors.

Respectfully,

Stuart

Stuart Gedal

617-543-6792